

REMARKS

Claims 20-26 are in this application. Claims 1-19 are canceled and 20-26 were previously presented. Claims 20 and 24 are the independent claims herein.

No new matter is added to the application as a result of this Response. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103

Claims 20, 21, 23, and 24 were rejected as being unpatentable over Tanner, U.S. Pat. Pub. 2002/0180786 (hereinafter, Tanner) in view of “IBM Software Agent Technology Helps Users Control Web Information”, Business Wire, July 30, 1997 (hereinafter, IBM). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant first notes that the pending claims relate to a device and method to interact with network sites over a network interface. For example, claim 20 relates to a storage device storing browser software adapted to control a processor to download and display information from a plurality of network sites, characteristic information associated with each of a plurality of network sites, preference information including a ranking of preferred ones of the plurality of network sites as measured by the characteristic information for automatically configuring user preferences indicated by the browser software, and instructions adapted to be executed by the processor to: detect network activity of the user when the user operates the browser software to interact with the plurality of network sites, update the characteristic information based on the detected network activity, the characteristic information including information identifying the duration and frequency of visits to each of the plurality of network sites, and update the preference information based on the updated characteristic information to automatically reconfigure user preferences indicated by said browser software.

Thus, it is clear that the claimed storage device stores browser software that controls a processor to download and display, inter alia, preference information including a ranking of preferred ones of said plurality of network sites as measured by the characteristic information for automatically configuring user preferences indicated by the browser software, and instructions adapted to be executed by said processor to, inter alia, update the preference information based on the updated characteristic information to automatically reconfigure user preferences indicated by said browser software. Claim 24 relates to a method that is, in relevant part, similar to claim 20.

Tanner was cited and relied upon in the Office Action to disclose all aspects of claims 20 and 24 except for a ranking of previously accessed sites. To compensate for the admitted shortcomings of Tanner, IBM was cited and relied upon for disclosing ranking of previously accessed sites. However, Applicant respectfully submits that Tanner and IBM do not disclose that for which they were cited and relied upon for disclosing.

Applicant respectfully submits that the cited and relied upon IBM discloses a Web Browser Interface (WBI) explicitly disclosed as "an intermediary between a web browser and the web" (IBM, pg. 1, para. 8, ln. 1-2). Thus, it is clear that the disclosed WBI is not a browser but instead is an agent distinct from the browser and located between a web browser and the web. Also, IBM does not disclose ranking viewed sites based on duration of viewing. IBM only discloses rank order based on frequency and how recently the site was viewed. (IBM, pg. 1, para. 4, ln. 4-8)

Therefore, the cited and relied upon IBM disclosed WBI does not rank sites the same as Applicant's claimed ranking. Furthermore, the IBM disclosed WBI is not the same as or suggestive of Applicant's claimed browser software that controls a processor rank preferred ones of the plurality of network sites as measured by the characteristic information for automatically configuring user preferences indicated by the browser software, where the characteristic information including information identifying the duration. The IBM ranking is not the same as the claimed ranking and the IBM WBI is

not the same as the claimed browser. The IBM ranking is different and the IBM device performing the ranking is different from the ranking and device claimed.

In contrast to the claimed method and computing device, Tanner specifically and explicitly relates to a filter to tailor a GUI based on a preferred arrangement of a GUI screen, appearance or lack thereof of certain fields, and other attributes of the GUI screen. Tanner discloses a method for filtering which components of a site (i.e., website) are displayed on a GUI screen of that site. (Tanner, para. 0005 and 0012) Tanner discloses preferences that relate to which components of a site are to be displayed on the GUI screen (e.g., frames and links). Tanner also discloses being concerned with and tracking which frames and links of a particular website are accessed. (Tanner, para. 0005 and 0012)

Tanner does not disclose or even suggest the claimed updating of the characteristic information based on the detected network activity, where the characteristic information includes information identifying the duration and frequency of visits to each of the plurality of network sites. Contrary to the Office's reliance thereon, Tanner explicitly discloses a user configuring the disclosed GUI filter preferences to hide frames and/or links not accessed within a user-specified period of time or a default period of time. (Tanner, para. 0014) That is, Tanner does not disclose the claimed characteristic information identifying the duration and frequency of visits to a plurality of networks sites. Tanner does not relate to or address the duration or frequency of website visits but instead monitors access to frames and links on a particular website (e.g., home page) so that future displays of that particular page only displays frequently accessed frames and links and hides other frames and links. (Tanner, para. 0013 - 0014). Tanner does not disclose or suggest the claimed characteristic information identifying the duration and frequency of visits to a plurality of networks sites since Tanner relates to filtering GUI screens, not any user preference regarding a plurality of network sites.

Therefore, even if Tanner and IBM were combined as asserted in the Office Action (not admitted as feasible by Applicant), the resulting combination would not

render claims 20 and 24 obvious under 35 USC 103(a) since the alleged combination lacks disclosure or suggestion of, at least, the claimed browser software adapted to control a processor to download and display information from a plurality of network sites, characteristic information associated with each of a plurality of network sites, preference information including a ranking of preferred ones of the plurality of network sites as measured by the characteristic information for automatically configuring user preferences indicated by the browser software, and instructions adapted to be executed by the processor to: detect network activity of the user when the user operates the browser software to interact with the plurality of network sites, update the characteristic information based on the detected network activity, the characteristic information including information identifying the duration and frequency of visits to each of the plurality of network sites, and update the preference information based on the updated characteristic information to automatically reconfigure user preferences indicated by said browser software.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 20 and 24 are patentable over the combination of Tanner and IBM for at least the reasons discussed above.

Claims 21 and 23 depend from claim 20 and claims 25-26 depend from claim 24. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 21, 23 and 25-26 are patentable over Tanner and IBM for at last depending on allowable claims 20 and 24.

Claim 22 was rejected as being unpatentable over Tanner and IBM, in further view of Ambroziak, USPN 6,415,319 B1 (hereinafter, Ambroziak). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action rejected claim 22 on the basis that Tanner and IBM substantially discloses the claimed invention, as related to claims 20 and 24. For at least the reasons stated hereinabove with respect to claims 20 and 24, Applicant respectfully reiterates that Tanner and IBM do not substantially disclose or suggest the claimed invention. Accordingly, the combining of the insufficient disclosures of Tanner and IBM with Ambroziak does not render claim 22 obvious. Applicant respectfully


requests the reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 22 under 35 USC 103(a).

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the pending claims. If any issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of the present application, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned via telephone at (203) 972-5985.

Respectfully submitted,

February 2, 2006
Date



Randolph P. Calhoun
Registration No. 45,371
Buckley, Maschoff & Talwalkar LLC
Five Elm Street
New Canaan, CT 06840
(203) 972-5985